



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES**

Paper No. 11

Application Number: 10/046,596  
Filing Date: October 23, 2001  
Appellant(s): SCHAFFER, MICHAEL J.

---

Rhonda L. Sheldon  
For Appellant

**EXAMINER'S ANSWER**

This is in response to the appeal brief filed July 21, 2003.

**(1) *Real Party in Interest***

A statement identifying the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

**(2) *Related Appeals and Interferences***

A statement identifying the related appeals and interferences which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the decision in the pending appeal is contained in the brief.

**(3) *Status of Claims***

The statement of the status of the claims contained in the brief is correct.

**(4) *Status of Amendments After Final***

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

**(5) *Summary of Invention***

The summary of invention contained in the brief is correct.

**(6) *Issues***

The appellant's statement of the issues in the brief is correct.

**(7) *Grouping of Claims***

The appellant's statement in the brief that certain claims do not stand or fall together is not agreed with because all independent claims would appear to contain the same subject matter. In particular, each and every independent claim such as 1, 4, 9 and 12 and 14 would appear to

Art Unit: 2821

disclose the claimed invention in a virtually identical manner as they all contain common subject matter or structures. In view of their similarities, the examiner strongly believes that all claims are stand or fall together, especially since appellant fails to particularly set forth a compelling reason which would warrant otherwise.

**(8) *Claims Appealed***

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

**(9) *Prior Art of Record***

6.456242

Crawford

9-2002

**(10) *Grounds of Rejection***

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

11. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in-

(1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effect under this subsection of a national application published under section 122(b) only if the international application designating the United States was published under Article 21(2)(a) of such treaty in the English language; or

(2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that a patent shall not be deemed filed in the United States for the purposes of this subsection based on the filing of an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a).

12. Claims 1, 4, 7, 9, 12 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Crawford (USP. 6,456,242).

Regarding claim 1, Crawford disclose an integrated chassis antenna comprising :

- a wireless network computer (100) having a chassis (102) (Fig. 1);

Art Unit: 2821

- an integrated chassis antenna (238) that is coupled to the computer chassis (202) (Fig. 3) (Col. 5, Line 5);
- a first wireless network device (260) coupled to the integrated chassis antenna (238) (Fig. 3) (Col. 6, Line 40); and
- a second wireless network device (250) operative to communicate with the wireless network computer (Col. 6, line 10).

Regarding claims 4 and 7, Crawford disclose an integrated chassis antenna comprising :

- a chassis (202) (Fig. 3);
- an antenna (450) with feed point (308) (Col. 8, Line 1); wherein
- the antenna (450) integrated into a chassis (402) (Col. 7, Line 58); and
- the antenna (540) includes a center conductor retention feature (588) (Fig. 9).

Regarding claim 9, Crawford disclose an integrated chassis antenna comprising :

- a chassis (202) and a wireless device (250) and the antenna having a feed point (308) (Col. 8, Line 1); and
- the wireless device (570) coupled to the feed point (580) of the antenna (540) (Fig. 9) (Col. 10, Line 25).

- Regarding claim 14, Crawford disclose a method comprising:
- Fabricating a chassis (Col. 2, Line 5); and
- Integrating an antenna with the chassis (Col. 2, Line 9).

*Allowable Subject Matter*

Art Unit: 2821

13. Claims 2, 3, 5-6, 8, 10-11, 13 and 15-24 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

The prior art of record fails to appreciate the advantage offered by the integrated antenna is formed from a part of the base chassis with the following distinctive features such as set by all dependent claims.

### ***Response to Argument***

With respect to the rejection applied to claim 1 as being anticipated by Crawford, appellant alleges this prior art of record fails to teach an integrated chassis antenna in the broad manner as recited. Basically the argument alleges that the printed microstrip antennas are mounted on or attached to the housing 202 as opposed to be an integral part of the housing.

This argument has not been found to be persuasive for the reason that appellant neglects to support the allegation with clear language in claim 1 that would warrant its interpretation in the manner as taught by the specification. As broadly as reasonably allowed, attaching or mounting the microstrip antennas to housing 202 clearly renders the over all antenna structure as being an integral part of the computer chassis (see lines 65-68, column 2 bridging lines 1-8, column 3). It is strongly believed that Crawford clearly anticipates claim 1 in the manner that line 3 of the claim itself clearly calls for an antenna to be coupled to the computer chassis. For clarity purpose, it is particularly noted that coupling an antenna to the computer chassis is equivalent to mounting or attaching an antenna structure of housing 202. It is also noted that the language in claim 1 neither clearly points out nor hints the making of the antenna, let alone the

Art Unit: 2821

particular material involved in its structure. Since the language of this claim has not been written in the means plus function form that would otherwise require a precise interpretation of claim language in light of the specific teaching of the specification, holding claim 1 as being anticipated by Crawford is clearly reasonable as allowed. Contrary to appellant's assertion, Crawford clearly teaches and anticipates every element as recited in claim 1. For at least the above noted reason, sustaining the anticipated rejection applied claim 1 is respectfully requested.

As for the rejection applied to claim 2 being unpatentable over Crawford, it is hereby withdrawn upon reconsideration. As such, the argument is moot.

By the same token as that noted for claim 1, the arguments for claims 4, 9 and 14 have not been found persuasive, especially since the basis which forms the arguments for patentability for these claims remains the same as that of claim 1. Like the structure of claims 4 and 9 and the method step of claim 14, the antenna structure in Crawford is every bit integrated with the housing as that defined by the claimed invention. For this reason, interpreting these claims to be more distinctive than Crawford would clearly be erroneous. Furthermore, the fact that all arguments for patentability for claims 1, 4, 9 and 14 are identical, holding them stand or fall together with claim 1 would clearly be proper.

In view of the foregoing reasons, sustaining all rejections applied to claims 1, 4, 9 and 14 as being anticipated by Crawford is respectfully urged.

Art Unit: 2821

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

TDC

September 22, 2003


Conferees:  Olik Chaudhuri, SPE 2823


Chuc Tran, Examiner 2821

Don Wong, SPE 2821

\*\*\*

Timothy N. Trop  
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.  
8554 KATY FWY, STE 100  
HOUSTON, TX 77024-1805

  
Don Wong  
Supervisory Patent Examiner  
Technology Center 2800

  
Chuc Tran, Examiner 2821